



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,523	01/11/2002	Heribert Baldus	PHDE 010012	6224

24737 7590 01/05/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

JONES III, CLYDE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/043,523	BALDUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Clyde H. Jones III	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed in the 10/03/2006 Remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Hargrove fails to teach or suggest the function modules of the layer lying above the bottom layer jointly form an application interface which can process an application software of various manufacturer-dependent central monitoring systems [Remarks page 2, last paragraph-page 4, line 1] and more specifically that Hargrove's presentation layer does not form an application interface because it can not process an application software of various manufacture-dependent central monitoring systems.

The examiner respectfully disagrees because Hargrove teaches the presentation layer 250-fig.2 is above the bottom/physical layer 200 and provides an interface for the application interface/layer 260 which can process central monitoring system application software (any application/process that uses the application layer/API to interface through to the physical layer to access hardware is a central monitoring system application because the application layer is the main/central interface from which the application can systematically track, i.e., monitor, information related to the hardware and/or physical layers of the system/network; col. 2, lines 34-39) inherently provided by different software manufacturers (col. 1, lines 67-col. 2, line 7; col. 2, lines 32-33,37-39; in which diverse manufacturer's of software have to make drivers for diverse operating systems, e.g. Microsoft, Unix, Apple, etc., and BIOSs in order to provide an "open"

Art Unit: 2623

interconnection standard so that heterogeneous systems may access the manufacture specific hardware/network components of the system via the systems specific BIOS/firmware). In other words Seagate, IBM, Linksys, etc. have to create drivers that are mounted with the OS/BIOS of the system so the APIs can interface with the corresponding manufactures hardware, e.g., Ethernet cards, RAID hard drives, etc. The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hargrove (US 6,891,804 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Hargrove teaches a transponder (transmitter/receiver) with firmware (software for interfacing with physical/hardware components)

which firmware comprise several overlaid layers 260-200 (fig. 2) containing several software components known as function modules (col. 2, lines 15-17),

where a bottom layer (physical layer 200) contains the function modules which describe the functionality of the hardware components of the transponder (col. 2, lines 9-10; col. 4, lines 47-53, lines 62-64),

and the function modules of the layer (presentation layer 250) lying above the bottom layer jointly (the layers rely on each other for definition of functions; col. 2, lines 16-18) form an application interface which can process an application software of various manufacturer-dependent central monitoring systems (col. 2, lines 31-35; in which the presentation layer inherently provides the standard interface for heterogeneous systems, e.g., application programs from software companies, or the application layer 260 to communicate with lower layers of the of the component; furthermore the applications/application layer is the central monitoring software for the various transactions that occur below it, e.g., file transfers and inter host control/access is enabled by the application layer 260; col. 2, lines 34-39) [Hargrove teaches the presentation layer 250-fig.2 is above the bottom/physical layer 200 and provides an interface for the application interface/layer 260 which can process central monitoring system application software (an application/process that uses the application layer to interface through to the physical layer to access hardware is a central monitoring system application because the application layer is the main/central interface from which the application can systematically track, i.e., monitor, information related to the hardware and/or physical layers of the system/network; col. 2, lines 34-39) inherently provided by different software manufacturers (col. 1, lines 67-col. 2, line 7; col. 2, lines 32-33,37-39; in which diverse manufacturers of software have to make drivers for

Art Unit: 2623

diverse operating systems, e.g., Microsoft, Unix, Apple, etc., and BIOSs in order to provide an "open" interconnection standard so that heterogeneous systems may access the manufacturer specific hardware/network components of the system via the systems specific BIOS/firmware)], and hence the same transponder can be used in different monitoring systems with different protocols (col. 4, lines 41-46; col. 4, lines 64-67) and management purposes (col. 5, lines 29-41 & col. 6, lines 6-16; in which the components can be used to manage gigabit Ethernet, fibre channels, RAIDS, etc.).

Regarding claim 3, Hargrove teaches the function modules of the layer lying over the bottom layer are provided for access to the other function modules of the same layer and the bottom layer (col. 2, lines 15-18; in which higher layers, i.e., the presentation layer 250, uses its protocols and functions to further access/transact with the lower level protocols down to the physical layer via the stacking/layering method as disclosed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargrove (US 6,891,804 B2) in view of Doshi et al. (US 6,041,051).

Regarding claim 2, Hargrove teaches a network element belonging to the transponder is a network element of a fiber channel network with Gigabit Ethernet/IEEE 802.3 standard compatibility (col. 5, lines 30-42; col. 3, lines 9-10), however fails to specifically disclose a HFC network.

In an analogous art Doshi teaches a HFC network for communication between a headend transmission network and LAN using the IEEE 802.3 standard (col. 5, lines 31-44; col. 6, lines 18-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Hargrove to include a HFC network as taught by Doshi for the advantage of providing a reduced cost headend system that integrates the LAN and transmission sides of the network (Doshi – col. 5, lines 29-32; Hargrove – col. 5, lines 39-42).

6. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hargrove (US 6,891,804 B2) in view of Hind et al. (US 6,976,163 B1).

Regarding claim 4, Hargrove teaches the upper layer (application layer 260) is provided for access by a supplier (system user/host) of the central monitoring system (col. 2, lines 34-39) and for the downloading (transfer) of new application programs by the supplier of the central monitoring system (col. 2, lines 35-36), and in that the bottom layer and the layer lying over the bottom layer are provided for access (col. 2, lines 31-

Art Unit: 2623

33 & col. 4, lines 47-54, lines 57-67). However, Hargrove fails to teach access/downloading of function modules by the transponder manufacturer.

In an analogous art Hind teaches access/downloading of function modules (firmware updates) by the device manufacturer, e.g., to fix Ethernet adaptor/transponder hardware issues in a flexible and cost effective manner (col. 15, lines 1-8; col. 14, lines 58-21; col. 15, lines 10-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Hargrove to include access/downloading of function modules by the transponder manufacturer as taught by Hind for the added advantages reducing enterprise customer cost and enabling authorized manufactures to provide updated firmware/patches (Hind – col. 14, lines 58-61; col. 15, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 5, Hargrove in view of Hind teach the hardware forming the basis of the transponder is intended for exchange while the layer lying over the lower layer and the upper layer can remain unchanged (col. 4, lines 47-54; in which the lower layer enables the exchanging of hardware without making changes to any of the layers above).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2623

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clyde H. Jones III whose telephone number is 571-272-5946. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30 p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CJ



CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600